

REMARKS

The application has been amended to place the application in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claim 6 is amended to correct the spelling of braking to address the claim objection noted in the Official Action.

Claims 1-23 are rejected as unpatentable over MESSAGE et al. FR 2 804 479 in view of LISOWSKY 5,044,784. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is amended and recites a means for continuously braking the rotating part during rotation thereof.

The Official Action offers Figures 19 and 20 of MESSAGE et al. as teaching a means 62, 62a for braking a rotating part (inner part 4). However, the MESSAGE reference does not teach that for which it is offered and does not teach a means for continuously braking a rotating part during rotation thereof.

The embodiments of Figs. 19 and 20 of MESSAGE are subsequent to each other in time. In Figure 19, the inner part 4 is not able to rotate with respect to the outer part 2 because the parts 2 and 4 are temporarily fastened to each other through friction facing 64. Thus, MESSAGE does not meet the limitation of a rotating part being braked during rotation of the rotating part.

In the embodiment of Figure 20, part 4 is able to rotate with respect to part 2 because the friction facing 64 has been separated from the flange 62a. Since friction member 64 is separated from flange 62a, these elements would not act as a brake and thus would not meet the limitation of a means for continuously braking the rotating part.

LISOWSKY is only cited for the teaching of plural flexible tabs. LISOWSKY does not teach or suggest a means for continuously braking a rotating part.

The above-noted feature is missing from each of the references, is absent from the combination, and thus would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 2-21 depend from claim 1 and further define the invention and are also believed patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent claims 22 and 23 recite a brake for continuously braking a rotating part during the rotation thereof. The analysis above regarding claim 1 is equally applicable to claims 22 and 23.

Claim 15 is rejected as unpatentable over MESSAGE et al. in view of LISOWSKY and further in view of LANDRIEVE FR 2 810 088. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

LANDRIEVE is only cited for the teaching of a seal protecting braking means. LANDRIEVE does not teach or suggest what is recited in claim 1. As set forth above, MESSAGE et al.

in view of LISOWSKY does not teach or suggest what is recited in claim 1. Since claim 15 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, the proposed combination of references would not render obvious claim 15.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

LM/mjr
August 17, 2005